27th May 2010

Clerk of the Court United States District Court District of Maryland U.S. Courthouse, Room 330 101 West Lombard Street Baltimore, MD 21201

COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP JACK REISE 120 East Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500 Boca Raton, FL 33432

VENABLE LLP JAMES A DUNBAR 210 West Pennsylvania Ave Suite 500 Towson, MD 21204 FILED ENTERE

JUN 0 4 2010

AL BALTIMORE OLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

BY

DEPUTY

I hereby wish to enter my strong objection to the proposed settlement of the Class Action suit No. 1:06-cv-01892-WMN (Consolidated), Roy T. Lefkoe v. Jos. A. Bank Clothiers, Inc. et al, of which I am a class member by virtue of a stock purchase on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2006, which shares continue to be held.

The reasons for my objections are as follows:

- 1. I object on philosophical grounds that simple greed; i.e. speculation rather than investment, should not affect the return on my investments. The purchase of shares of any company necessarily involves an assumption of the inherent risk of operating that company. These risks are many and include the quality of sales projections, the quality of inventory plans, and many others including the state of the economy. The additional risk that results from class action lawsuits based on simple greed should not be a factor.
- 2. I object on the grounds that the mere fact of being sued adversely affects the ability of the company to operate. It drains time and talent from operating the business away toward defending against the lawsuit. This has caused my investment to be materially damaged from lost opportunity.
- 3. I object on the grounds that the company incurs a real, and potentially substantial, cost from defending the lawsuit. This has caused my investment to be materially damaged by the loss of profit.
- 4. If lawsuits such as these are allowed to stand, what protection do we investors have against speculators buying a few shares in a temporarily distressed company; then looking back into the past to find something that could retrospectively be categorized as less than full disclosure, and bring a lawsuit based on that evidence.
- 5. It is my opinion that the plaintiff simply did not do an adequate job of evaluating the risk potential involved with a short term investment made for speculative purposes.

Respectfully.

808 Caledonian Way

Birmingham, AL 35242-0501

Tel: 205-969-5987